

41. Urban Renewal Plans. Findings adequate to demonstrate that an urban renewal plan “conforms to the comprehensive plan as a whole” pursuant to ORS 457.095(3) must at least (1) set forth the applicable comprehensive plan provisions and (2) express the local government’s judgment as to the relationship between the renewal plan and the pertinent plan provisions. While the phrase “as a whole” in ORS 457.095(3) may allow the local government to balance competing plan policies, it does not allow the local government to address only some policies it identifies as being applicable and, without explanation, fail to address others also identified as applicable. *Zimmerman v. Columbia County*, 40 Or LUBA 483 (2001).

41. Urban Renewal Plans. A comprehensive plan policy that the county restrict rural industrial development to uses that will not require improvements at public expense is not necessarily inconsistent with adoption of an urban renewal plan that will provide publicly funded improvements to support future rural industrial development, where the policy can be read in context to allow such improvements. In that circumstance, rather than interpret the policy in the first instance, LUBA will remand a decision approving the urban renewal plan to the county to explain why the urban renewal plan conforms to the policy. *Zimmerman v. Columbia County*, 40 Or LUBA 483 (2001).

41. Urban Renewal Plans. The assumptions underlying the county’s revenue projections and its conclusion that an urban renewal plan is “feasible” under ORS 457.095(6) and 457.085(3)(g) must be supported by substantial evidence, *i.e.*, evidence a reasonable person would rely upon. The local government need not demonstrate that projected new development is presently committed and certain to occur. *Zimmerman v. Columbia County*, 40 Or LUBA 483 (2001).

41. Urban Renewal Plans. A reasonable person could conclude that revenue projections for an urban renewal plan are feasible for purposes of ORS 457.095(6) and 457.085(3)(g), where expert evidence in the record shows that the total debt can be retired if four new industrial developments locate in the industrial park improved under the renewal plan, that three new industrial developments have advanced plans to locate in the park, and that the park, once improved, is likely to attract at least one other new industrial development over the relevant time period. *Zimmerman v. Columbia County*, 40 Or LUBA 483 (2001).

41. Urban Renewal Plans. In adopting an amendment to an urban renewal plan, a city commits no error in relying on the report adopted two years earlier in support of the original urban renewal plan, where there have been only relatively minor changes in the urban renewal district since the urban renewal plan was originally adopted. *Holladay Investors, Ltd. v. City of Portland*, 22 Or LUBA 90 (1991).

41. Urban Renewal Plans. In amending its urban renewal plan, a city is not required to adopt a financial analysis for an unsubsidized headquarters hotel or find that an unsubsidized headquarters hotel is financially feasible under ORS 457.085(3)(g) and 457.095(6) where (1) the original urban renewal plan included a subsidized headquarters hotel as an authorized project, and (2) the amendment to the urban renewal plan does not

presently withdraw authorization for a public subsidy for the headquarters hotel. *Holladay Investors, Ltd. v. City of Portland*, 22 Or LUBA 90 (1991).

41. Urban Renewal Plans. Where a property tax limitation constitutional amendment renders uncertain an urban renewal agency's authority to collect property taxes outside the constitutional limit, an urban renewal agency's conclusion that it has such authority is supported by substantial evidence where that conclusion is based on an opinion of the state attorney general. *Holladay Investors, Ltd. v. City of Portland*, 22 Or LUBA 90 (1991).